

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended at page 1 by inserting the application serial numbers of the related applications.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 8, 11-14, 18 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,320,587 to Funyu, hereafter Funyu.

Independent claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended by adding the following language at the end thereof:

“wherein said language element is a symbol representative of a complete message to be presented as part of the user interface of the companion computing device, and wherein said message is comprised of either multiple characters of arbitrary language, character set or a graphic icon”.

It is submitted that the amendment to independent claims 1, 11 and 21 obviates the rejection.

Funyu essentially describes a system that downloads font data to a web browser, this browser may be hosted on either a PDA, terminal, or other computing device as described at column 2, lines 14 - 16. As described in claim 1 of Funyu, “the character resources extracting program causing the client information processing unit, upon receipt of the character media data, to download the required font resources from the server information processing unit”. What this means, in other words, is that if some program running in Funyu

(for example, a browser) is required to display some character font it does not have, it will download the required font from a server.

In contrast, rather than translate individual fonts in the client information processing unit, as specified in Funyu, amended claims 1, 11 and 21 recite that a "language element is a symbol representative of a complete message to be presented as part of the user interface of the companion computing device". Several examples will illustrate why the claimed invention and Funyu are fundamentally different. In the example given in the application a "copyright" notice may be presented as either a bitmap graphic icon like the universal copyright symbol ("c" with a circle around it), or another image. In Funyu, there is no single character in the standard ASCII character set that represents copyright, so this may have to be done in three letters, as in "(c)". The distinction is that Funyu's fonts are translated on a character specific substitution, whereas in the present invention a "Language Element" is a complete message that is to be displayed to a user. Again for clarification, in Funyu, a character font is requested and translated on a character by character basis. In the present invention, a language element is a complete message or user interface element to be presented to a user. The present invention does not concern itself with individual character fonts.

As another case to illustrate the differences, if it is desired to display a message in double byte characters (Kanji), in Funyu the client information unit would need to understand the character encoding of the message in order to determine what fonts to download. For double byte characters, this involves knowing the encoding (Shift-JIS or JIS), reading the first byte of the character and comparing it against a table to determine if it is a single byte character or if the next byte is a continuation of the character code that represent a single character with two bytes. In the present invention, the client information unit only needs to know a single identifier associated with the whole message and the

single bitmap that represents this message. This vastly simplifies the processing required of the information unit.

Another example is a line of text in right-to-left language like Arabic. In Funyu the client information unit would need to know that it has to arrange character images from right to left. In traditional Japanese and Chinese, it is also possible to arrange characters from top to bottom. In contrast, in the present invention there would be no need for the client information unit to be aware of such language specific complexities, which are taken care of by the host system. These examples illustrate what was intended in the present invention as "national language support", which is clearly not taught by Funyu.

A final scenario may further help to clarify the difference between the claimed invention and Funyu. In the present invention, a "companion subsystem" (client information unit) can be sold in multiple countries without any country specific modifications. Since the subsystem device issues a generic "Language Element" identifier to a retrieve message element for use in its user interface, only the host program that responds with the bitmap image needs to change from region to region. This allows, for example, the present invention to have an initial "welcome" message presented in English, Chinese, or Japanese, without changing any of the information on the subsystem itself. In an English language region the host system would provide an English language bitmap of the complete welcome message. In a Chinese region, the host system would provide a complete Kanji message in a layout appropriate for the specific device. In contrast, Funyu requires that the actual character codes for the string that comprises the "welcome" message would need to be changed to the character codes appropriate for a specific region. This would require additional effort and expense by the manufacturer and be a burden that is relieved by the present invention.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-4, 8, 11-14, 18 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Funyu is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 5-7, 9, 10, 15-17, 19, 20 and 24 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Funyu.

This rejection is obviated by the amendment to claims 1, 11 and 21 as set forth in the discussion of claims 1, 11 and 21. That is, Funyu does not teach that the "language element is a symbol representative of a complete message to be presented as part of the user interface of the companion computing device".


For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 5-7, 9, 10, 15-17, 19, 20 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action cites a number of references that were not applied in the rejections of the claims. These references have been reviewed, but are believed to be inapplicable to the claims.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 1-24 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 12-9-04



Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500